PTO/SB/17p (11-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2007. OMB 0651-0031 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE er the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

## PETITION FEE Under 37 CFR 1.17(f), (g) & (h) TRANSMITTAL

(Fees are subject to annual revision)

Send completed form to: Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

·		
Application Number	10/621,046	
Filing Date	July 16, 2003	
First Named Inventor	Constantine P. GRIGOROPOULOS	
Art Unit	2813	
Examiner Name	Chandra P. Chaudhari	
Attorney Docket Number	UCB-6(B01-108)	

	Enclosed is a petition filed under 37 CFR 5.25 that requires a processing fee (37 CFR 1.17(f), (g), or (h)). Payment of \$ 200.00 is enclosed.  This form should be included with the above-mentioned petition and faxed or mailed to the Office using the appropriate Mail Stop (e.g., Mail Stop Petition), if applicable. For transmittal of processing fees under 37 CFR 1.17(i), see form PTO/SB/17i.		
	Enclose a duplicative copy of this form for fee processing.	to Deposit Account No. 13-3083 iciency of fees and credit of any overpayments (\$200.00 Petition Fee and \$225.00 Extension Fee)	
Petition Fees under 37 CFR 1.17(f): Fee \$400 Fee Code 1462  For petitions filed under:  § 1.53(e) - to accord a filing date. § 1.57(a) - to accord a filing date. § 1.57(a) - to accord a filing date. § 1.182 - for decision on a question not specifically provided for. § 1.183 - to suspend the rules. § 1.378(e) - for reconsideration of decision on petition refusing to accept delayed payment of maintenance fee in an expired patent. § 1.741(b) - to accord a filing date to an application under § 1.740 for extension of a patent term.  Petition Fees under 37 CFR 1.17(g): Fee \$200 Fee Code 1463  For petitions filed under: § 1.12 - for access to an assignment record. § 1.14 - for access to an application. § 1.47 - for filing by other than all the inventors or a person not the inventor. § 1.59 - for expungement of information. § 1.103(a) - to suspend action in an application. § 1.103(a) - to suspend action in an application. § 1.136(b) - for review of a request for extension of time when the provisions of section 1.136(a) are not available. § 1.295 - for review of refusal to publish a statutory invention registration. § 1.296 - to withdraw a request for publication of a statutory invention registration filed on or after the date the notice of intent to publish issued. § 1.377 - for review of decision refusing to accept and record payment of a maintenance fee filed prior to expiration of a patent. § 1.550(c) - for patent owner requests for extension of time in exparter reasonation proceedings. § 1.956 - for patent owner requests for extension of time in exparter reasonation proceedings. § 5.15 - for changing the scope of a license. § 5.15 - for retroactive license.			
	§ 1.91 - for entry of a model or exhibit. § 1.102(d) - to make an application special. § 1.138(c) - to expressly abandon an application to avoid publication. § 1.313 - to withdraw an application from issue. § 1.314 - to deforessuance of a patent.	OFFICE OF PETITIONS	
_	Signature	July 20, 2005	
	Peter L. Michaelson	30,090	
	Typed or printed name	Registration No., if applicable	

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.17. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 5 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

#### PATENT APPLICATION

Applicants: Constantine P. GRIGOROPOULOS, Nicole R. BIERI, Dimos POULIKAKOS, Jaewon CHUNG

Atty. Doc. No.: UCB-6(B01-108)

Serial No.: 10/621,046 Filed: July 16, 2003

Group Art Unit: 2813 Confirmation No.: 8907

Examiner: Chandra P. Chaudhari

Title: A METHOD FOR PRODUCING A STRUCTURE USING

NANOPARTICLES

Mail Stop Petitions Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

S I R:

SUPPLEMENTAL PETITION PURSUANT TO 07/27/2005 AKELLEY 00000016 10621046 35 U.S.C § 184 FOR

01 FC:1463 200.00 RETROACTIVE FOREIGN FILING LICENSE

#### <u>Petition</u>

Applicants respectfully petition pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 184 that the foreign filing license granted for the above application on November 25, 2003 be given retroactive effect to January 9, 2001.

JUL 2 6 2005

#### Supplemental Petition

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

On August 11, 2004 Applicants petitioned pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 184 for the retroactive granting of a foreign filing license for the above US patent application.

Appl. No. 10/621,046 Supplemental Petition Reply to Decision on Request of March 22, 2005

This petition was denied March 22, 2005 on the grounds that the requirements of 35 C.F.R. § 5.25(a)(3)(i, ii, iii) have not been met. A copy of the Decision on Request is attached.

The present Supplemental Petition includes the attached:

- a) Declaration from Constantine P. Grigoropoulos, the lead inventor, and
- b) Declaration from George Wolken, Jr., the lead attorney prosecuting the above-identified US patent application.

These declarations aver that: i) No secrecy order was or is in effect; ii) A foreign filing license was diligently sought following discovery of reasonable grounds for seeking one; and iii) An explanation of why the material was filed abroad without foreign filing license and without deceptive intent.

In light of the above, the attached Declarations, and the Petition and materials filed on August 11, 2004, applicants respectfully request that the foreign filing license granted on November 25, 2003 be given retroactive effect to January 9, 2001.

Respectfully submitted,

July 20, 2005

Peter L. Michaelson, Attorney

Customer No. 007265

Reg. No. 30,090 (732) 530-6671

Appl. No. 10/621,046 Supplemental Petition Reply to Decision on Request of March 22, 2005

MICHAELSON & ASSOCIATES Counselors at Law Parkway 109 Office Center 328 Newman Springs Road P.O. Box 8489 Red Bank, New Jersey 07701

#### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING under 37 C.F.R. 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited on **July 21, 2005** with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Petitions, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Signature

Charlen 30,090
Reg. No.

(UCB6SUPPLPETITION/ca:19)



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBE

FILING DATE

FIRST NAMED APPLICANT

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

10/621,046

11-Aug-04

CONSTANTINE GRIGOROPOULOS, ET AL.

UCB-6 (B01-108)

Title:

A METHOD FOR REPRODUCING A STRUTURE

**USING NANOPARTICLES** 

Art Unit

Paper Number

Correspondence Address:

PETER L. MICHAELSON MICHAELSON & ASSOCIATES PARKWAY 109 OFFICE CENTER 328 NEWMAN SPRINGS ROAD P.O. BOX 8489 **RED BANK, NEW JERSEY 07701** 

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE MAILED

MAR 22 2005

LICENSING & REVIEW

Please find attached a communication from the Examiner regarding the Petition for Retroactive License under 37 CFR 5.25.

RECEIVED

JUL 2 6 2005

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS** 



#### United States Patent and Trademark Office

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 2023I
www.uspto.gov

In re:

GRIGOROPOULOS, et al.

:DECISION ON REQUEST

PetitionFiling Date:

August 11, 2004

:UNDER 37 CFR 5.25

Serial No.:

10/621,046

Docket No.:

UCB-6 (B01-108)

Title: A METHOD

FOR PRODUCING

A STRUCTURE

**USING** 

**NANOPARTICLES** 

This is a decision on the petition filed August 11, 2004 for retroactive foreign filing license.

Decision: Denied

JUL 2 6 2005

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

37 CFR 5.25(a) requires the following:

- 1. A listing of each of the foreign countries in which the unlicensed patent application material was filed,
- 2. The dates on which the material was filed in each country,
- 3. A verified statement (oath or declaration) containing:
  - i. An averment that the subject matter in question was not under a secrecy order at the time it was filed abroad, and that it is not currently under a secrecy order,
  - ii. A showing that the license has been diligently sought after discovery of the proscribed foreign filing, and
  - iii. An explanation of why the material was filed abroad through error and without deceptive intent without the required license under \$ 5.11 first having been obtained, and
- 4. The required fee ( \$ 1.17(h)).

The petition is Denied at this time in that the petition is defective since the requirements set forth in 37 C.F.R. 5.25(a)(3)(i, ii, iii) have not been met.

Although the Petition of Mr. Michaelson states the facts, background and basis for the Petition, there is no verified statement or declaration as to the nature of the error, or how and when it was discovered (thereby supporting a showing of diligence). The Petition merely states that a review of the facts indicates the possibility of an error occurred to invoke legal proceedings. In affect, it is not clear from the Petition that the invention was made in the U.S. (i.e. that a foreign filing license is required) consequently invoking 35 U.S.C. 184 and 185. Petitioners must file a declaration(s) containing the pertinent information. Such a statement should include averments by those persons responsible for or having personal knowledge of the acts regarding filing in a foreign country (which may or may not be Mr. Michaelson, depending on his involvement in the foreign filing) and should be accompanied by copies of any necessary supporting documents such as letters of transmittal or instructions for filing. The acts which are alleged to constitute error without deceptive intent should cover the period leading up to and including each of the proscribed foreign filings.

Thus, in the absence of a verified statement including an explanation or showing that the license was diligently sought, and that the foreign application was filed through error without deceptive intent, the provisions of 37 CFR 5.25 have not been met.

Accordingly, the provisions of 37 CFR 5.25 not having been fully met, the petition is DENIED, and in the absence of any response within 60 days of the mailing date of this letter, such denial will be made final and the final action under 35 U.S.C. 185 will be taken. Extensions of time may be had under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a).

Yvønne R. Abbott Patent Examiner

Licensing & Review

(703) 308-2866

RECEIVED

JUL 2 6 2005

OFFICE OF PETITIONS



## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

#### PATENT APPLICATION

Applicants: Constantine P. GRIGOROPOULOS, Nicole R. BIERI, Dimos POULIKAKOS, Jaewon CHUNG

Atty. Doc. No.: UCB-6(B01-108)

Serial No.: 10/621,046

Filed: July 16, 2003

Group Art Unit: 2813

Confirmation No.: 8907

Examiner:

Title: A METHOD FOR PRODUCING A STRUCTURE USING NANOPARTICLES

Mail Stop Petitions Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 RECEIVED

JUL 2 6 2005

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

SIR:

#### Declaration of Constantine P. Grigoropoulos in Support of Petition for Retroactive Foreign filing License

I, the undersigned Constantine P. Grigoropoulous, hereby declare and affirm as follows:

1. I am the first named inventor for the above-identified US patent application. I am presently employed by the University of California, Berkeley ("UC-B") as Professor of Mechanical Engineering in the College of Engineering. I have held this position for the entire period of time described in this declaration. I have

personal knowledge of the facts and circumstances surrounding the invention described and claimed in the above-referenced patent application.

- 2. During the spring academic term of the year 2000 while on leave from UC-B, I conducted research at the Eidgenossische Technische Hochschule ("ETH") in Zurich, Switzerland.
- 3. This research at ETH resulted in a European patent application. I participated in the preparation and filing of this European patent application in cooperation with ETH and Swiss patent counsel retained by them. This European patent application was filed on or about January 10, 2001.
- 4. The subject matter of the European patent application was not under a secrecy order at the time it was filed in Europe, has not been made the subject of a secrecy order subsequent to that date, and is not now subject to a secrecy order.

# JUL 2 6 2005 OFFICE OF PETITIONS

5. As of the date the European patent application was filed, I believed that the invention described and claimed therein resulted from research conducted by me and my collaborators at ETH, outside of the United States and, therefore, not subject to the foreign filing requirements of the US patent laws and regulations. This opinion was formed in good faith and based upon my personal knowledge of the subject matter of the European patent application in light of the research conducted by me and my

collaborators at ETH. Therefore, filing of the European patent application without a US foreign filing license was without deceptive intent.

- 6. After the filing of the European patent application, I and my co-inventors conducted further research on the subject matter of the invention, including research conducted in the United States. The above-referenced US patent application contains subject matter resulting from our work at ETH as well as from our work in the United States.
- 7. The subject matter of the above-referenced U.S. patent application was not under a secrecy order at the time it was filed and is not now under a secrecy order.
- 8. All statements made herein are made based upon information and belief, and are believed to be true, and that this declaration is made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both (18 U.S.C. 1001), and may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issuing thereon.

Subscribed this 4 Day of July, 2005.

Constantine P. Grigoropoulos



### IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

#### PATENT APPLICATION

Applicants: Constantine P. GRIGOROPOULOS, Nicole R. BIERI, Dimos POULIKAKOS, Jaewon CHUNG

Atty. Doc. No.: UCB-6(B01-108)

Serial No.: 10/621,046

Filed: July 16, 2003

Group Art Unit: 2813

Confirmation No.: 8907

Examiner:

Title: A METHOD FOR PRODUCING A STRUCTURE USING NANOPARTICLES

Mail Stop Petitions Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED

JUL 2 6 2005

S I R:

Declaration of George Wolken, Jr. in Support of Petition for Retroactive Foreign filing License OFFICE OF PETITIONS

I, the undersigned George Wolken, Jr., hereby declare and affirm as follows:

1. I am a patent attorney registered to practice before the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO"), Reg. No. 30,441, and Of Counsel with the firm of Michaelson & Associates, USPTO Customer No. 007265. I have personal knowledge of the facts and circumstances surrounding the preparation, filing and prosecution of the above-identified application before the USPTO.

- 2. On or about June 13, 2003, the firm of Michaelson & Associates was retained by the Regents of the University of California on behalf of the University of California-Berkeley ("UC-B") to prosecute the above-identified patent application, and I was designated lead attorney to handle this matter. A US patent application was filed July 16, 2003 and received application serial number 10/621,046 ("'046"). A foreign filing license for this application was granted on November 23, 2003. No secrecy order has been imposed on the '046 application.
- 3. The '046 application was filed including subject matter from European Patent Application No. 01 100 537.8 ("EPA") as well as subject matter developed by the named inventors following the filing of the EPA. The EPA has previously been made of record in this case.
- 4. Based on information received during interviews with UC-B inventors, I concluded that the subject matter contained in the EPA was not invented in the US but derived from research activities occurring in Switzerland while UC-B researchers were temporary visitors at the Eidgenossische Technische Hochschule ("ETH") in Zurich, Switzerland. I also concluded from the same information that research activities conducted in the US contributed to subject matter contained in the '046 application.
- 5. UC-B and ETH entered into an Inter-Institutional Agreement ("IIA") on July 6, 2004 related to the subject matter of the EPA and the '046 application. This IIA recites that research conducted both at ETH and at UC-B led to an "Invention" that is the subject matter of both the EPA and US patent applications. The first two pages of the IIA are attached hereto. I had no part in the negotiation or drafting

of the IIA and was not aware of its contents until after it had been executed by the parties.

- 6. I decided that the recitations in the IIA cast doubt on my conclusion that the subject matter of the EPA was invented outside the US. Rather than perpetuate such uncertainty, I concluded that seeking a retroactive foreign filing license pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 184 was the proper course under statute and regulations. No secrecy order had been imposed and the subject matter had been granted a foreign filing license on November 23, 2003. The petition for a retroactive foreign filing license was diligently sought following the IIA and filed August 11, 2004.
- 7. All statements made herein are made based upon information and belief, and are believed to be true, and that this declaration is made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both (18 U.S.C. 1001), and may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issuing thereon.

Subscribed this 19# Day of July, 2005.

George Wolken, Jr.

Attachment: Inter-Institutional Agreement, pages 1 and 2.

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY LICENSING



#### Inter-Institutional Agreement for Producing a Structure Using Nanoparticles

UC Case No: B01-108

ETH Zurich Reference: T-01-009

This agreement is effective \_\_\_\_\_\_ ("Effective Date") and is by and between, THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, a California Corporation, whose legal address is 1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor, Oakland, California 94607-5200, acting through its Office of Technology Licensing, at the University of California, Berkeley, 2150 Shattuck Avenue, Suite 510, Berkeley, CA 94720-1620, ("REGENTS") and Eidgenossische Technische Hochschule Zurich, represented by Prof. Dr. Dimos Poulikakos, Institute of Energy Technology, whose legal address is ETH Zentrum ML J 36, Sonneggstrasse 3, CH-8092 Zurich, ("ETH Zurich").

#### BACKGROUND

Certain research conducted at the University of California (UC) by Prof. Constantine
Grigoropoulos and Dr. Jaewon Chung was supported by an unrestricted gift fund administered by
the University, and certain research conducted at ETH Zurich by Nicole Bieri and Dimos
Poulikakos was supported by ETH Zurich.

RECEIVED

JUL 2 6 2005

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

Inter-Institutional Agreement

UC Case No. B01-108

The research resulted in the development of fabrication of structures using nanoparticles, described in UC Case No. B01-108, ETH Zurich Reference T-01-009 ("Invention"), invented by Prof. Constantine Grigoropoulos and Dr. Jaewon Chung of UC and Nicole Bieri and Dimos Poulikakos of ETH Zurich (collectively, "INVENTORS").

Prof. Constantine Grigoropoulos and Dr. Jaewon Chung have each agreed to assign their rights in the Invention to REGENTS, subject to REGENTS patent policy.

Nicole Bieri and Dimos Poulikakos have each agreed to assign their undivided patent rights in the Invention to ETH Zurich, subject to the patent policy of that institution.

ETH Zurich authorized the filing of a patent application with the European Patent Office, claiming the Invention, and such EPO application was filed on October 1, 2001.

UC authorized the filing of a utility patent application with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, claiming the Invention and including improvements made by the inventors since the filing of the EPO application, and such U.S. application was filed on July 16, 2003.

Concurrently with the US filing, ETH authorized filing in the EPO of a continuation also claiming the improvements.

It is the mutual desire of the parties that ETH Zurich will take responsibility for obtaining and maintaining patent protection in territories of the EPO, and UC will be responsible for obtaining and maintaining patent protection in the US.

It is further the desire of the parties that licensing and commercialization of the Invention be managed by REGENTS on behalf of both parties, subject to any overriding obligations of REGENTS and ETH Zurich to the sponsors of the research; and to that end ETH Zurich agrees not to grant to any person (other than REGENTS) any right, title, or interest in and to the Invention or the Patent Rights.

NOW, THEREFORE, for and in consideration of the mutual covenants and promises, REGENTS and ETH Zurich agree as follows.

#### 1. DEFINITIONS

- 1.1 "Patent Rights" means all right, title and interest in and to the following:
  - a) European Patent Application No. EP 1 223 615, filed October 1, 2001; and
  - b) United States Patent Application Serial No. 10/621,046, filed July 16, 2003; and